

The reality is that for too many in the world today Cubans are supposed to be content with their lot, to be quiet; to, in the words of one of our colleagues in this Congress recently, to move on. The regime that enslaves a Nation and imprisons hundreds of heroes simply for their beliefs deserves unilateral rewards and concessions, many argue, such as more travel or dollars. But Dr. Biscet and the many other heroes imprisoned in the Castro brothers' gulag will not be able to be ignored forever. They must be freed. And political parties must be legalized, as well as independent press agencies, and labor unions. And free and fair elections must take place in Cuba.

Many of those imprisoned today, Mr. Speaker, will be democratically elected leaders tomorrow. That is what is going to happen in Cuba tomorrow. Today, as they suffer the most unjust of cruel imprisonment, we here remember and honor them and, once again, demand the immediate release of all prisoners of conscience in the Castro brothers' infernal gulag.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROUN of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FLEMING addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### CARTER PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, today, in fact less than 1 hour to 1½ hours ago, I rose on the floor of this House to bring forward a privileged resolution asking for the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee to step down or be removed until such time as the ethical problems that have been raised about Mr. RANGEL could be addressed by the Ethics Committee and resolved. I did this out of no malice for Mr. RANGEL; but, rather, I did this and have stated publicly that it is important that we raise the level of the ethics standards of this House to a level that was inspired to us by our Speaker. And, if we raise our level of ethics and each individual in this House takes on themselves to stand up for an ethical Congress, we will have an ethical Congress, and maybe the people of the United States will have a greater respect for the individual Members of Congress.

It should be embarrassing and disheartening to every hard-working man

and woman in this House, and the House is full of hard-working men and women on both sides of the aisle, that the American public view us as unethical and maybe worse.

Our approval rating at one time during the last Congress was at 8 percent. They say if your approval rating is below 20 percent, the only people that still like you are your friends and your relatives. Well, at 8 percent, you have got to worry about your relatives. You may not even have them liking you anymore. To me, I looked at that, and I have been in this Congress now for 6 years, starting my 7th year, I know that there are a lot of really fine people in this Congress on both sides of the aisle and I don't think that they deserve that kind of rating. But, quite frankly, the atmosphere that has been created over the last several years has created an atmosphere where people think that we are evil people. And I don't believe that we are evil people, but I do believe that sometimes somebody has to stand up and say, if it isn't right, it isn't right. And I have decided that I am going to do that. And I think I am going to be joined by others who are going to do it, and I hope eventually we are all going to stand up and say: If it isn't right, it isn't right, and I don't care who did it.

But I want to start off by telling you that what happened in this privileged resolution that I brought forward today, which, if it had gone forward in the privileged resolution, we would have had 1 hour of debate on each side to discuss this issue and come to a resolution, just like maybe a jury would come to a resolution in a courtroom back home, where we would hear what is out there, what has been said on this House floor by Mr. RANGEL, what the evidence seems to be; that we would learn about what is going on, and what would be best for the House under these circumstances. But, unfortunately, a procedural occurrence interfered or intervened.

The majority made a motion to table that resolution. The majority prevailed, as they would be expected to with the sizeable majority count that they have in this House, and so that resolution was laid upon the table; which basically means to the average guy that they stuck it aside and we won't take it up. And that is where it is going to stay, I suppose, just as previous resolutions have been tabled and they don't get taken up.

So I have this hour, and hopefully some of my friends will be by as we go through this hour, and we are going to talk about ethics. And I want to first point out this poster right here, which I would hope can be seen.

The Speaker of this House, NANCY PELOSI, on November 8, 2006, made this statement, which was quoted by the Washington Post: "The American people voted to restore integrity and honesty in Washington, D.C., and the Democrats intend to lead the most honest, most open, and most ethical

Congress in history." That is a 200-plus year history of this United States, and the goal of the 110th Congress, the standards set by our Speaker was to be the most open, most ethical Congress, and the most honest Congress in the history of the United States. That is a big package to carry, there is no doubt about that, but it is a goal that we ought to have. I would argue that, since this speech was made, we have made very little progress down that line.

But something else much more recent to what we are doing right now is what the President of the United States said basically just last week: "I campaigned on changing Washington and bottom-up politics. I don't want to send the message to the American people that there are two sets of standards, one for the powerful people, and one for the ordinary folks who are working every day and paying their taxes." That is a quote to CNN by President Barack Obama, February 3, 2009, just last week. I honor our President for that kind of standard that he sets for his administration and for this government.

There are people who would say: Mr. CARTER, you raised these issues about the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, about CHARLIE RANGEL, for political purposes. You did this because you wanted to attack a powerful leader in the House of Representatives, and this is all about politics.

I will point out that I stated when this all started that I first wrote a letter to Chairman RANGEL and asked Chairman RANGEL if he would address the issue of having paid his taxes, if he would address paying his penalties and interest so this would all go away, so he wouldn't be treated by two standards, one standard for the powerful and one standard for the ordinary person. But I got no response from that letter. A copy of that letter was sent to the Speaker of the House, and I got no response there.

And then you ask, why would I stand up and start talking about this stuff? The New York Times on September 14, 2008 pointed out: "Mounting embarrassment for taxpayers and Congress makes it imperative that Representative Charles Rangel step aside as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee while his ethical problems are investigated."

Now, this is one of the most liberal, Democrat leaning newspapers in the country who is saying there are issues in Mr. RANGEL's past that, in their opinion, the editorial page's opinion, would require that he step down while he is being investigated. And that is all I have ever really asked that he do. It might be for just 2 days, 3 days. Who knows how quickly the Ethics Committee will come out with a resolution. It might be a few weeks. But it would look a standard to the American people that would say: You are right, this is not behind closed doors. This is heads up. They are talking about stuff that is